THE UNITARIAN.

Vol. I. JUNE 1, 1834. No. 6.

Some of the Obstacles to be overcome in the Search for Truth.

The first obstacle we shall consider is a fear of inquiry, and it is one which always has been, and still continues to be, among the strongest of the strong holds of error. There is an opinion abroad that men may inquire too far for their own safety; that there are some things which it would be presumptuous to look into; and that our peace of mind and general well-being require us, sometimes, to forbear all examination, and remain contented with notions that have always been in our mind without our well knowing by what process they came there. So far even have these apprehensions affected some minds, as to have induced the belief that *guilt* may be contracted by wandering out of the circle of time-honored opinions and pushing into a new and untrodden field of inquiry. And when we see a man who has shaken off the binding influence of this fear, we are too often apt to look on him as we do on the reckless youth who has voluntarily left the peace and security of the paternal roof, to be tossed about by the storm and bustle of the world.

This obstacle, therefore, must be entirely overcome; for it is preposterous to expect to obtain the truth while we are afraid of inquiring for it. All the truth now abroad in the world is the result of free inquiry, and it is reasonable to suppose that all yet to appear will be obtained by the same process. Fearless inquiry may terminate in error, but timid and cautious efforts will never be rewarded with truth. There is no danger in the most unlimited investigation; we cannot trespass on forbidden ground; there are no secrets in the moral or natural world into which we may fear to penetrate.

So long as a person is impressed with the necessity of being impartial and diligent, and places a proper estimate on his own powers, there is no limit beyond which he may fear to carry his researches. Guilt in this matter is out of the question; for however erroneous may be the conclusions or disastrous the consequences to which we have been conducted, yet if we were actuated by a sincere, honest, and conscientious desire to find the truth, we are absolved from blame. We have only used those faculties which God has given us for high and noble purposes, and we may be anxious lest we have unknowingly adopted an error, but there can be no upbraidings of conscience to disturb our peace. Let it, however, be recollected, that guilt may be contracted by a blind perseverance in our present opinions. If they be wrong and we neglect the means of seeing and correcting the error, then are we to blame for the non-performance of one of the highest duties our Maker has imposed on a responsible being.

A very common objection to free inquiry, and one which is urged with irresistible force on timid minds, is, that it tends to unsettle our opinions and leave us in a state of perplexity and doubt. But surely, if our opinions are wrong, the sooner they are unsettled the better; and if right, then inquiry, by making us acquainted with their foundations and bearings, will strengthen our belief and increase our regard for them. Depend upon it, that when a person is prevented from examining the grounds of his opinions for this reason, there exists in his mind a lurking suspicion that they are unsound and incapable of bearing a severe and thorough scrutiny.

There is a prejudice too against *doubt*, the absurdity of which is equalled only by its injurious consequences, and is altogether unworthy of an independent mind. So far as moral culpability is involved, doubt, certainly, is no more objectionable than positive belief, and indeed not so much so sometimes, if we can ever incur blame for our honest opinions. Nobody objects to doubting on subjects of trivial moment; why, then, should it be blameworthy in matters of essential importance, when belief or disbelief may be followed by consequences involving our happiness to an indefinite extent? When one has examined a subject of vital interest, and found the considerations for and against to be equal, as far as he can see, what, under such circumstances, can be more worthy a rational mind than a state of doubt? Not only would it be perfectly right, but there can be no hesitation in declaring that not to doubt would be a flagrant vio-

lation of duty, and render us culpable to the full extent of the importance of the subject under discussion.

Another bad effect of this fear of inquiry is, that it not only shackles our own minds, but leads us to look with distrust and even unfriendliness on those who have more fortunately emancipated themselves from its chilling influence. Even the Baconian philosophy was at first suspected of a false tendency, and a general hue and cry was raised against it for the purpose of putting it down, and its author was stigmatized as an atheist, — the man who declared that he would "rather believe all the fables of the Legend and the Talmud and the Koran than that this universal frame is without a Mind."

Another great obstacle to the reception of truth is the influence of the will and affections; and none is more common than this, for few can so far obtain the mastery of themselves as to be totally unbiassed in their inquiries by prepossessions of one kind or another. Even in the most fearless and indefatigable minds there may exist a lurking desire to find certain notions true or false, which will have an influence on the result of their investigations, however unconscious they may be of having received any unfavorable bias. It needs no laboured argument, therefore, to prove that when a man proceeds to examine a particular subject with his feelings strongly enlisted for or against it, he will be as likely to come out wrong as right. It is with opinions as with friends in whom an accidental circumstance discloses to our astonishment defects which to everybody else, who has been unblinded by partiality and favour, have always been as plain as noonday. There is, besides, a pride, an overweening confidence in our own attainments, that prevents us from arriving at the truth, when such a result would require the abandonment of some long-cherished and favorite opinion; more especially, if this opinion be one of common belief and high estimation. When Harvey announced his discovery of the circulation of the blood every voice was against him, and the patient philosopher was stigmatized by his contemporaries as a visionary or an impostor. To admit the reality of this discovery would have demanded an entire revolution in their opinions and a confession of past ignorance, which pride loudly cried out against and forbade. Our rejection of new facts or doctrines is, generally, not so much on account of that deficiency of proof that is complained of, as of an inveterate aversion to acknowledge, as we practically should by adopting them, that we have hitherto been always in an error.

In some people this presents an insuperable barrier to the reception of truth; and the more you endeavour to convince them, the more disinclined will they be to think that the opinions they have held so long, and for which they have contended so strenuously, are totally and evidently false. Unless, therefore, we can free our minds from all partiality and passion, the only effect of inquiry will be to embitter prejudices and strengthen errors, while it leaves behind the flattering unction that we have sought for and obtained the truth.

The next class of obstacles that we shall consider consists in the *Idols of the Cave,* as Bacon quaintly terms them, or those prejudices that are peculiar to every individual and seem to form a portion of his very character. "In addition to the general waywardness of human nature, every man has his own peculiar den or cavern, which breaks and corrupts the light of nature." It is matter of common notoriety that the same scenes, the same arguments, and the same facts, make very different impressions on different people; and thus, knowing that every man has a way of his own both of thinking and acting, we can generally tell with considerable certainty how such or such a person will be affected when certain facts or doctrines are addressed to his attention. This shows that people adopt their ideas, not so much for the truth that is in them, as because they harmonize with other ideas which they have imbibed and love to cherish. Men may manifest a sincere and earnest desire for truth, and pursue it impartially too in most cases, while on some subjects a darling prejudice forever blinds them to conviction and shuts out the light of nature from their understandings. These prejudices prove more injurious to the individual than any others, or all others put together; for that knowledge of human nature of which worldly men boast so much, as the grand secret of success in life, is generally nothing more than an acquaintance with these prejudices in their various shapes and fashions. It is upon the management of these that men rely for their success in the game of life; and the ingenuous youth, who from his infancy may have listened only to the lessons of honour, purity, and elevated principle, at last pushes his little bark into the stream before him, with the parting counsel ringing in his ears, "Attack no favourite notions, flatter men's prejudices, sacrifice your own to others' opinions." Thus it happens that honest men are too frequently proscribed, while knaves pass for your only good and true.

The Idols of the Cave are as numerous as the individuals

of the race, but we can here particularize only a few. The great failing with some people is a quickness of temper which can be easily roused by an expression of opinions different from their own, and kindled into a blaze by a zealous defence of them. Such must necessarily make slow advances in knowledge; for as the acquisition of every new truth is generally obtained by a triumph over old errors, coolness and patience are essential to success in the great contest of opinion that is going on in the world. Lose your temper and you become an early victim to the enemy. To be offended and angry, because a man chooses to entertain and defend a belief contrary to our own, begets a habit of considering all our opinions as settled beyond dispute, and produces a spirit of self-confidence and arrogance utterly hostile to the interests of truth. A discredit too is thrown upon our own cause, for it is a matter of common belief that what such a man wants in argument and fact he makes up in passion and fury. It is allowable to have the feelings interested and even the whole man moved, but the mild light of true, healthy excitement is quite a different thing from the blaze of passion.

Again, some people are afflicted with a mean and suspicious spirit, that leads them to sit in judgment on motives and causes, when they have no business with anything more than what falls within the cognizance of their senses. Instead of judging things according to their intrinsic merits, they must first look at the source whence they came, they must pry into motives and designs, and will be guided in their conclusions according to the belief they form relative to these points. The same doctrines, the same arguments, and the same facts, which would be cheerfully received from one man, are beheld with distrust and derision, when coming from another. The evil of this spirit is that it draws off the attention from things themselves, which alone are worthy of notice, to fix it on persons, who may have only an accidental or unimportant connexion with them. Bentham very happily treats of this disposition, and his remarks are full of pith and force. "In bringing forward or supporting the measure in question, the person in question entertains a bad design; therefore the measure is bad: — he is a person of a bad character; therefore the measure is bad: — he is actuated by a bad motive; therefore the measure is bad: — he has fallen into inconsistencies; on a former occasion he either opposed it, or made some observation not reconcileable with some observation which he has advanced on the present occasion;

therefore the measure is bad: — he is on a footing of intimacy with this or that person who is a man of dangerous principles and designs, or has been seen more or less frequently in his company, or has professed or is suspected of entertaining some opinion which the other has professed or been suspected of entertaining; therefore the measure is bad: — he bears a a name that at a former period was borne by a set of men, now no more, by whom bad principles were entertained or bad things done; therefore the measure is bad. . . . . In proportion to the degree of efficiency with which a man suffers these instruments of deception to operate upon his mind, he enables bad men to exercise over him a sort of power, the thought of which ought to cover him with shame. Allow this argument the effect of a conclusive one, you put it into the power of any man to draw you at pleasure from the support of every measure, which in your own eyes is good, to force you to give your support to any and every measure which in your own eyes is bad. Is it good? — the bad man embraces it, and, by the supposition, you reject it. Is it bad? — he vituperates it, and that suffices for driving you into its embrace. You split upon the rocks, because he has avoided them; you miss the harbour, because he has steered into it."*

The next class of obstacles to which we solicit attention are what Bacon calls *Idols of the Market-Place*, or those prejudices arising from mere words and terms in our common intercourse with mankind. It may be truly said that much of the error that is in the world, and much of the obstinacy with which truth is denied admission into the mind, may be justly attributed to the influence of mere words and phrases. Few prejudices are so strong as these; they form opinions, regulate conduct, and establish the conventional forms of society. Does anyone wish to be told that there is a power in words and names independent of their etymological meaning, derived from the countless associations that gather around them from persons, things, places, scenes, and opinions? The strongest arguments a well-trained intellect can muster, and the most striking illustrations that ingenuity can devise, will often fail of effecting an object which the skilful use of a single word might easily have accomplished. Examples of the influence of words may be seen in the use that has been made of such terms

* The Book of Fallacies: from Unfinished Papers of Jeremy Benthem. — pp. 129 - 33.

as *divine right*, *legitimacy*, *democracy*, *aristocracy*, *heresy*, *orthodoxy*, etc., which have overturned the institutions of ages, and fattened the earth with blood. Did the good people know the meaning of these words? Not they. Let a word be well defined and well understood, and it is no longer a subject of dispute; it becomes like one of your harmless, useful, necessary people who go through the world peaceably and quietly without jostling.

If words are thus powerful, if they have been made substitutes for reason and experience and common sense, what are we to think of those phrases that pass current in the world, utterly devoid of meaning in themselves, but nevertheless endowed with irresistible authority? Six hundred years ago, a fanatical hermit had but to run from city to city and cry out, *It is God's will*, to draw out all Europe in battle-array against people as good as themselves, and desolate the land with famine and slaughter. The disastrous influence of words and phrases on the cause of science is visible on every page of its history. The common language that the sun rises and sets was at the bottom of all the hue and cry that was raised against the Copernican theory. An old axiom in the schools, and one with which many a precious piece of sophistry was clenched, with what justice may be imagined, was, *Vis unita fortior, — United strength is stronger*. Now this phrase undoubtedly contains an obvious truth when properly applied, yet who would imagine that any mind could be so perverted as to bring it forth, in all soberness and sincerity, as a triumphant argument against the utility of spectacles? And yet such was really the case. Soon after spectacles and other optical instruments were introduced into England, a sturdy Aristotelian set out to prove that they were all deceitful and fallacious. For, says he, take two pair of spectacles and use them at the same time, and you will not see so well as with one singly; therefore, allowing the proposition to be true that *united strength is stronger*, men must be deceived in thinking that one pair enables them to see any better than the naked eye. That is, people were to disbelieve the evidence of their own senses, on the strength of a mere phrase. It was no doubt a sufficient answer to this objection, to ask why with two pens we cannot write better than with one.

Every day's observation must convince us, how much stronger and wider is the influence exerted over men's opinions and conduct by words and phrases, than that of consid-

erations addressed to their moral and intellectual nature. Where is the logic, or the philosophy, or the common sense, that has demolished half so many doctrines as many a dolt has by a well-timed use of such terms as *visionary*, *speculative*, *chimerical*, *theoretical*, etc.? These are the epithets which are hailed with delight, and repeated triumphantly, by weak, ignorant, and bigoted men, when any proposition is presented to their attention too large for their capacities to embrace, and too wide and benevolent in its operations to be relished by their mean and narrow dispositions. To fix upon it a contemptuous epithet like these settles its character with the multitude, rids us of its troublesome claims, and obtains for us the senseless praise of sagacity, experience, and knowledge. Does a neighbour unfold to you some noble scheme of utility and enterprise, and enforce his claims for your assistance too strongly to be resisted; does he enjoin upon you a course of conduct brilliant and honourable in itself, but in opposition to your feeble resolutions and sluggish temper; you perhaps proceed forthwith, carefully and fairly, though unsuccessfully no doubt, to lay open the defects of his plans and expose the fallacy of his reasonings. O man, how unhacknied art thou in the ways of the world, and how little hast thou profited by the example of those whom men call shrewd and wise! You had only to utter that phrase of magic potency, "It is one thing to talk and another to practise," or, "I am for practice, you for theory," to silence the most formidable battery of arguments, and establish your own reputation for wisdom and strong judgment.

Such are some of the obstacles that debar the understanding from the reception of truth; and, in view of the formidable array which they present, a doubt may well be pardoned of its final and perfect triumph over the dominion of error. But believing, as we are amply warranted by the consciousness of man's noble destinies, that there is a congeniality and correspondence between the nature of truth and that of the human mind, which neither time nor condition can destroy, though it may conceal, we see no reason why we should despair or despond as to the result. Recollections of its brilliant and signal triumphs will confirm and brighten the glorious hope, that, notwithstanding the strong dominion of error, notwithstanding the countless prejudices of man's own mind, THE TRUTH IS GREAT AND WILL FINALLY PREVAIL.

R.

Study of the Scriptures.

In the present communication I propose to treat of the obligation and importance of scriptural inquiry with reference to controverted doctrines.

1. I am met at the outset by the objection, that people almost destitute of theological knowledge have frequently exhibited the purest virtue and the most ardent piety, have diligently done and submissively borne God's will, have died with a hope full of immortality, and are now, doubtless, inheriting the promises. True, indeed. If the kingdom of heaven has its subjects, thousands of such Christians are among them. But was it their ignorance which saved them? You will say, It was their faith. But their faith in what? Not, surely, in what they were ignorant of, but in what they knew. They obeyed Christ, because they knew that he was their Saviour, not because they had no distinct conception of his nature. They humbled themselves in penitence, because they knew that they were sinners, not because they were ignorant of the origin and nature of sin. They trusted in God in bereavement, anguish, and death, because they knew that he was the God of their lives and would be their portion for ever,—not because they were utterly unable to define his essence, the mode of his existence, and the plan of his moral government. And if it was their knowledge, not their ignorance, which made them holy and entitled them to the hope of heaven, a greater degree of religious knowledge might have made them better men. Had they possessed it, they might have exhibited a brighter example not only of the passive but of the active virtues. They might have recommended their religion not only by the sanctity of their lives, but by the wisdom and winning eloquence of their instructions. They might have diffused through a whole community that holy light which illumined the path of duty to a few of their humble associates. And, as in that firmament where the righteous shall shine for ever and ever one star differeth from another star in glory, their spirits freed from earth might have been arrayed in purer lustre there.

Again, what is the gospel standard of attainments? Consult the parable of the talents. He is welcomed to the joy of his Lord who has faithfully used the means of improvement entrusted to him, be they great or small. That poverty-stricken,

widowed mother, who spares a moment from her daily toil to glean a few words of comfort from the sacred volume, and who can then look up from the children of her love to the abode of her penury and say in the sincerity of faith, "Father of the fatherless and Judge of the widow, not my will but thine be done," — she, I say, has improved her talent, and eternity will reveal to her those treasures which were here sealed by the hand of Providence. But can you, who find leisure for every other research, can you to whom the hours of recreation and of social mirth regularly return, — can you hope to do in the unseen world the work which Providence assigned you here? That humble, ignorant Christian, who has simply drawn from the gospel the two great commands of love to God and love to man, and who keeps his heart and regulates his life by them, has improved his talent, and light from the Almighty's throne will dispel the shades which enveloped his earth-bound spirit and guide to the recesses of eternal truth. But can you whose minds are formed for the investigation of truth, enriched with human knowledge, conversant with the secret springs of nature's mechanism and with their own far more mysterious operations, can you expect that God will extend to your soul the promises of that revelation the study of which you treat as unworthy a refined intellect? Reason and Scripture forbid the hope. Judge of the consequences of the misimprovement of your many talents from the sentence passed upon him who wrapped his one in a napkin: "Cast ye the unprofitable servant into outer darkness; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth."

2. But it has been farther objected, that the study of the Scriptures for the purpose of obtaining theological knowledge cherishes the spirit of controversy and is unfavourable to charity. Let us try this objection by the evidence of fact. Who are our most obtrusive and virulent controversialists? They are men proverbially ignorant, who have never studied the Scriptures without a sectarian gloss, who have searched them only for proof-texts to confirm their prejudices, who have formally renounced the guidance of reason, who, rejecting the simple name of Christ, have denoted the origin and ground of their faith by adopting that of a Paul or an Apollos, an Athanasius or a Socinus, a Calvin or an Arminius.

Who, on the other hand, are those true disciples of the Prince of peace, who have laboured to make Christ's church on earth one family as are the saints in heaven? They have always been faithful and independent students of the sacred

volume. They have learned from its own spirit to distinguish between the fundamental and the non-essential, the speculative and the practical, the certain and the doubtful. They have learned from it a lesson which the hot-headed saint militant has never learned, that there are in God's word many things hard to be understood, on which Christians may innocently and conscientiously differ. And they have learned, too, to thank God that by the obscurity of some portions of his revelation he has left room for the exercise of the ennobling virtue of charity. The reformers of the sixteenth century brought with them from their mother-church the exclusive, uncompromising spirit of popery; but Melancthon, the most eminent biblical scholar among them, loved all Christians as brethren, and withheld even from the hated church of Rome the titles of scorn and derision which were heaped upon it by his fellows. And the history of his age is that of all succeeding ages. Among ignorant zealots, that intolerant, persecuting spirit, which was the curse of Popery, still subsists; and skill in the Scriptures, definite ideas on controverted points, and the most comprehensive charity still go hand in hand. Would you, then, cultivate charity? learn by diligent study of the Scriptures how wide is the field, how reasonable are the grounds of difference as to their interpretation.

3. But many, who love to use the Bible as their guide in practice, will object to its critical study with reference to those doctrines which are the subjects of theological controversy, that wise and faithful inquirers have reached such opposite results as to render hopeless the effort to arrive at the truth. If there are any such among my readers, I would say to them, You admit that the subjects of theological controversy, though not essential, are important, that truth is preferable to error, that the truth on these points, if it can be had, is worth having. But how will you attempt to obtain it? By precedent or appeal to the Scriptures? If by the former, every ecclesiastical history, every martyrology, every table of religious statistics will give you new views of the truth, and you can never, without becoming blind to the past and present, have a faith which you can call your own. But by the study of the Scriptures you may form definite and permanent opinions.

But perhaps you still say, We would gladly embrace the *truth* were we sure of finding it; but we would rather form no opinions on these points than form erroneous ones. To this I would answer, that the possession of definite opinions on controverted points is of great *practical* importance. To employ

a single example by way of illustration, to which I might add many others did time permit. We all admit the duty of love to God. Now what is our chief reason for loving God? Because he has manifested his love to us. And what is the most signal manifestation of his love? The work of human redemption. And how has he done this work? Says one, By endowing every man with the means of becoming virtuous and holy, and setting before him in the gospel the highest motives to become so. Says another, By attributing to the sufferings of Christ on Calvary efficacy sufficient to wash away the pollution of millions of depraved and impotent beings and to crown them all with eternal joy. And in the former, reflection on the vast multiplicity of God's spiritual favours, and in the latter, a sense of the overwhelming immensity of mercy displayed in the cross of Christ, may excite the most ardent gratitude and love. But where is he who has no definite notions on this subject? Without any idea of what he owes to God in the work of redemption, without knowing what he is grateful for, must not his gratitude be languid, his love cold? Similar considerations with respect to other controverted points might convince you of the necessity of entertaining definite ideas upon them, even if you cannot arrive at the truth; and these definite ideas are to be obtained only by a faithful study of the Scriptures.

And such a study every man, who has leisure and capacity for it, owes to that God under the inspiration of whose spirit they were written; and he who wilfully neglects it insults the Giver in undervaluing the precious gift. I grant that you might love God without knowing whether he be a threefold or an undivided essence, and it were better that you should never know than anathematize those who differ from you; but I cannot believe that you do love him, unless you use the means which he has given you of learning what he is. I grant that you might forsake sin without knowing whether it had its origin in inward depravity or external temptation, and it were better you should never know than pronounce those sinners who paint human nature a few shades lighter or darker than you do; but I cannot believe that you have felt the heinousness of sin, unless you have thought to inquire what led you to commit it. I grant that you might obtain salvation through Christ without knowing whether he suffered as a substitute for sinners or simply as the friend of sinners, and it were better you should never know than drive from the fountain opened for sin and uncleanness those who cannot approach it

with your own creed upon their lips; but I cannot believe that you sincerely desire to partake of the Christian salvation, unless you feel solicitous to know in what way the blood of Christ cleanseth from sin. Would you, then, show your gratitude to God and your interest in his truth, use his word not only as the guide of your practice, but as the rule of your faith.

If what I have said should prompt anyone to the duty of scriptural investigation or aid him in performing it, my labour will not have been in vain. There are circumstances in the present age and in our own country which render it peculiarly the duty of every intelligent Christian. At this time and in this community, no one can profess the Christian religion without lending his personal influence to some particular system of doctrines, to truth or error; and he, who, having time and ability so to do, neglects to make an independent choice, is guilty of ungrateful indifference to the cause of truth, of that truth to bear witness of which the Son of God assumed our nature, shared our infirmities, and died by the hands of the wicked. Christian, is he your Master, and do you love your Master? Prize truth for his sake, and for the sake of Him who sent him. Earnestly and devoutly seek it, and may the God of truth be your guide.

A. P. Peabody.

A Vision of Daniel.

It has not been uncommon with me to pursue study in my sleeping hours, and to dream in the night on the subject which had occupied my attention the preceding day. Not long since I meditated and wrote during the day on the various sects into which the disciples of Christ have become divided, and on some of the extraordinary opinions which have passed for essential doctrines of the gospel. After this day's labour I had a remarkable vision. I saw, or seemed to see, a new sect of Christians rise up and make considerable progress under a leader by the name of Theophilus. He had two essential doctrines by which his sect was to be distinguished: —

"I. That God is of such a nature that with him there is no forgiveness for the penitent sinner.

"II. That God devised a plan of vicarious punishment and vicarious obedience, as a substitute for forgiveness; and that on this vicarious plan the disciples of Jesus Christ are saved, without any expense of pardoning mercy."

As soon as the news of this sect had spread in the country some cried one thing and some another. The doctrine of *no forgiveness for the penitent* was regarded with a kind of horror; but when it was understood that Theophilus was a firm believer in that doctrine which supposes the atonement to have consisted in vicarious punishment, and that he believed the disciples of Christ to be saved solely on the ground of what he did and suffered, it began to be suspected that there might be something very good in the new sect. At a convention of Orthodox ministers a committee was appointed to wait on Theophilus and obtain from him an explanation of his views. Peter, James, and John were the committee. They soon visited Theophilus and he received them kindly. On being questioned by Peter, the chairman of the committee, as to his peculiar doctrines, he frankly repeated the above articles, and handed a copy of them to Peter. After reading the articles, Peter proposed that he and his brethren should consult together prior to making any remarks. Theophilus assented to the proposal and left the room. In about an hour Theophilus was informed that the committee were ready to see him. He soon came in, and Peter addressed him in the following manner: —

"We have examined your articles, and we are disposed to treat you with frankness and candour. We are happy in finding that you are a believer in the great doctrine of vicarious punishment and vicarious obedience. But we never had regarded these as a substitute for forgiveness; and it seems to us that you are in an error in supposing that 'God is of such a nature that with him there is no forgiveness for the penitent.' But instead of stating our objections at this time, we have concluded to ask of you the favour to furnish us, in the course of a few days, with the grounds or reasons on which you suppose the doctrine may be supported. This we think will be treating you more respectfully than for us to object to your doctrine without being informed of the ground on which it is supposed to rest." Theophilus thanked them for their candour, and assured them of his readiness to comply with their request. The parties then took each other by the hand, and separated with much appearance of mutual kindness.

I may here remark that Theophilus appeared to be a fluent speaker and a ready writer. The committee had been gone but a little time when he took his pen and sketched the following letter: —

"*June* 1, 1834.

"My worthy Friends,

"Not knowing what a day may bring forth, I have taken my pen to comply with your request. As you readily admit the great doctrine that the disciples of Christ are saved solely on the ground of what he has done and suffered for them, or on the ground of vicarious obedience and punishment, I shall frankly avow that it was on the principles of this doctrine that I formed the other, 'that such is the nature of God that with him there is no forgiveness for the penitent.' In support of the opinion I would invite your attention to the following particulars:

"1. The law and government of God proceed from his own unchangeable nature. This you will not deny.

"2. The word *forgiveness*, as used in Scripture and at the present day, has relation to some pecuniary *debt*, or to some *penalty* for a moral offence or crime. When a benevolent creditor cancels the debt due to him from a poor man, without any payment, we say he forgave the whole debt; and so saith the Scripture. But had a surety or a friend of the poor man paid the debt, we should not say that the creditor forgave it, though on receiving payment he gave up the bond. The *surety* may now forgive the debt, if he is disposed so to do; but it is too late for the original creditor to do it; he has been paid; the debt is no longer due to him.

"When forgiveness has respect to a *penalty* for a moral offence, it implies a remission of that penalty, not the execution of it. Forgiveness of a penalty precludes punishment, and punishment precludes forgiveness. When a felon is condemned by the laws of this state to be hanged, the power of pardon is with the governor and council. If pardon is granted, the felon is *not hanged*, but set at liberty. If the laws of the state allowed of vicarious punishment, and a substitute should be executed instead of the felon, the felon would of course be set at liberty; but he would not be pardoned, because the penalty of the law was inflicted on the substitute.

"3. The doctrine of vicarious punishment, as it is supposed to exist under the divine government, is built on this hypothesis — that every violation of the divine law must be punished, the threatened penalty must be invariably inflicted, either on the sinner or on his substitute. You believe that no repentance

of the sinner, however sincere, and however perfect his reformation, can render it just or proper in God to remit the penalty of the law against him, — except on the ground that it has been inflicted on his substitute. Are you not, then, aware that you implicitly accede to my doctrine, that there is no forgiveness with God for the penitent? If there had been forgiveness with God for the penitent, what possible need could there have been for a vicarious punishment on their account? None, surely. Nothing but the want of forgiveness with God could have rendered such a punishment necessary. Besides, if Christ actually suffered for all the penitent the penalty due for their offences, or an equivalent, so that the full demands of justice were satisfied, what remains to be forgiven? Nothing. It seems to me absurd to talk of forgiving an offence after the penalty has been inflicted.

"4. You believe, as fully as I do, that the obedience or 'righteousness of Christ is the only ground of the sinner's justification.' If, then, it is a fact that the Messiah suffered the punishment due to every penitent sinner, and if it is also true that his righteousness is the only ground of their justification and acceptance with God, what further proof can you need of the fact, that with God is no forgiveness for the penitent? And is it not clear that vicarious obedience and punishment are strictly a substitute for pardoning mercy? The penitent may indeed forever acknowledge, with gratitude, that they have been saved from punishment, not by forgiving love, but on the ground that their punishment was suffered by a substitute. They may also acknowledge that great favours have been bestowed on them, not by forgiving mercy, or on the ground of their gospel-obedience, but as an expression of God's love to his Son in obeying as their substitute.

"You will probably say that many passages of Scripture at least *seem* to imply that there is forgiveness with God. I once thought that these afforded ground for a powerful objection against the doctrine of no forgiveness. On reflection, however, I soon perceived that those passages had the same formidable bearing against the doctrine of atonement, considered as a vicarious punishment, as against the doctrine of no forgiveness with God, — and that I must relinquish the Orthodox view of the atonement, or find some way of explaining those passages, which *seem* to ascribe forgiveness to God, in a manner consistent with the doctrine of vicarious punishment. Which of the two I preferred you may perhaps judge from your own regard to that essential doctrine. If you wish to know how

the objection may be answered, you may look at the following particulars: —

"1. It is admitted that many passages of Scripture seem to imply that there is forgiveness with God; so there are passages which seem to imply that God repents, that he has eyes and ears, hands and feet. But learned men find no difficulty in saying that such passages are to be understood in a figurative sense. So in a figurative sense there may be forgiveness with God, as he exempts the penitent from punishment on the ground that Christ endured it in their stead or as their substitute.

"2. I find that much of what is said in the Bible on the forgiving love of God was written before the vicarious punishment was suffered, and probably by men who had very imperfect knowledge respecting the sufferings which Christ was to endure, or the purpose for which he would suffer.

"3. I think there is reason to believe that the apostles themselves, who were witnesses of the crucifixion, did not clearly understand that the sufferings of Christ were a vicarious punishment; and if they did not, they would be likely to speak of the forgiveness of God in a literal sense, as did Moses and the prophets. That the apostles did not understand Christ's suffering as a vicarious punishment seems to me very evident from the fact that in their sermons they never spoke of those sufferings as a punishment which he endured on account of our sins. This, I think, is strong evidence that they did not so understand them; for had they regarded them as they have been regarded by Orthodox Christians of our time, this must have appeared when they were speaking of the crucifixion. Some will probably pretend that what I have now admitted is an evidence against the truth of the doctrine as it has been held by you and by me. But let it be remembered that the apostles lived in a dark age of the world, compared with the present; that each succeeding generation grows wiser and wiser; that Christ himself considered his disciples as 'slow to believe' what Moses and the prophets had written concerning him; that when, after his resurrection, 'he opened their understandings that they might understand the Scriptures,' it does not appear that he said anything of the fact that he had suffered the punishment due to their sins and the sins of the whole world; that the apostles were under a great mistake as to the object of his mission and the nature of his kingdom, and continued in the hope of a temporal kingdom even to the very moment of his ascension. What reason, then,

have we to suppose that they understood his sufferings in the Orthodox sense? Besides, we know that other doctrines, which have been high in your esteem and in mine, did not receive their 'finishing touch' till several centuries after the apostolic age. For example, it does not appear that Moses or the prophets, Christ or his apostles, ever heard of a 'Three-one God,' or a God who is 'three distinct persons.' According to Mosheim this doctrine had not received its 'finishing touch' till some time in the latter half of the fourth century. It then came forth, as finished, from the fire of contention in an ecclesiastical council at Constantinople. But what Trinitarian thinks less highly of the doctrine on account of its recent origin? As further evidence that the apostles did not clearly understand and teach the doctrine of atonement, in our sense of the word, it may be observed that after Christ's sufferings were understood by Christians as of the nature of a vicarious punishment, or a *ransom* paid for their redemption, the believers were divided in opinion on the question, To whom was the ransom paid? Some said 'it was paid to God,' others said 'it was paid to the devil.' If the apostles had taught the doctrine as it is now understood by us, it is hardly to be supposed that Christians of former ages would have evinced such ignorance on the subject.

"I have written as much, perhaps, in compliance with your request as you expected, and enough, I hope, to convince you that there is no forgiveness with God for the penitent, if it be a truth, as we have believed, that he inflicted on his Son, as their substitute, the penalty due to their offences,—or an equivalent to that penalty, which fully answers all the demands of the divine law and divine justice. And you may remember how clearly it has been shown by Dr. Hopkins, Dr. Smalley, and other eminent writers, that by the sufferings inflicted on Christ the law is honoured, and divine justice is established, 'as much as if the law had been literally executed.' Dr. Smalley says, 'By the everlasting destruction of every transgressor God would not have appeared more glorious in holiness than he now does by the sacrifice of his own Son, in the eyes of everyone that believeth.' If, then, the full penalty of the law has been so completely executed, or its purposes so completely answered, by the sufferings inflicted on the Son of God, what remains to be forgiven? What *room* or what *need* for pardoning mercy?

"THEOPHILUS."

"TO MESSRS. PETER, JAMES, AND JOHN."

When Theophilus had finished his letter my vision was at an end. I have not yet heard what effect the letter had on the minds of the committee; but I think Theophilus has taken pretty strong ground, and that the prospects for a new sect are favourable. It would be gratifying to see as much prudence and candour manifested between the sects which have long existed as was witnessed in the vision.

DANIEL.

Zeal without Knowledge.

Is there any of this zeal among modern Christians? We wish we could say there is none; but it is evident that there is not much brotherly love among many who hold different views of Christianity. One of the saddest things in the Christian world is the unkindness which is manifested among different religious denominations. They call each other hard names, and those who cannot meet together in the same sanctuary can hardly meet anywhere else, with a cordial fellow-feeling for each other. And why? Simply because they conscientiously differ in their interpretation of the Scriptures. They all profess to have searched the Scriptures; they all profess to regard Jesus Christ as the Saviour of the world, and to avail themselves of the means he prescribed to secure eternal life; and yet we hear one say to another, "Believe as we do, or you cannot be saved," and this too in direct violation of the Bible, which says that everyone standeth or falleth to his own master, and that if perchance tares are growing with the wheat, it is not for us to interfere, but to let them grow till the harvest, and then they will be separated by the lord of the harvest. Now in whatever sect a zeal of this sort manifests itself, — and in some sects it must manifest itself, if they act consistently with their principles, and in others it does manifest itself, in opposition to their principles, — it is all wrong, it is a zeal which is not according to knowledge.

In the first place, it is not according to a knowledge of the faith and the characters of the dissenters from its own views. For of those who regard and treat dissenters from their own views with bitterness, there is not one out of ten, and perhaps not one out of an hundred, who has fairly examined the faith he condemns. It is completely prejudged. Its opponents have a vague horror of it, which is the result in a great measure of education, and like the Jews of Paul's time who rested in the law and made their boast of the law, they rest in their creed and make a boast of their creed, and believe there can be nothing better. Like them they make their boast of God, and are confident that they are guides of the blind, a light to them which are in darkness, instructers of the foolish, and teachers of babes, and that no other teachers can give better instruction. The course pursued by the exclusionist is on the very face of it unreasonable and inconsistent. It is a course which in everything else he as quickly as any man would condemn. Suppose, for instance, there was a particular class of men in the community who transacted business differently from the majority of men, but who were found in the intercourse of life to be equally pure, upright, and unexceptionable in their conduct, and a man should come to you and represent them as knaves, and tell you to shun them, should tell you that though they talked very well and acted very well, yet at heart they were without a particle of principle. Would you not regard such a man as inhuman? And yet where is the difference in the criminality of this conduct and that of the blind zealot, who, without having examined the principles or the character of his neighbour, goes about from house to house, and charges him with holding opinions which he disavows, and leading a life which has a show of piety perhaps, but is rooted and grounded in sin? We say, then, that the man who will not listen with patience and candour to the reasons which his neighbour gives for his faith, and fairly answer his arguments before condemning them, who will give him no credit for the sincerity of his professions of devotion to God nor his practical exhibition of it, who tells him to search the Scriptures, and then, if he does not come to such and such conclusions, pronounces him unfaithful, who tells him to pray, and then pronounces that his prayers are cold, reluctant, and ineffectual, who goes into his family and disturbs its peace by the spirit of proselytism, we say that such a man may have a zeal for God, but that it is a zeal which is not according to

knowledge. He knows nothing of his neighbour's faith and nothing of his life. His zeal is wholly a mistake; and though he has the gift of prophecy, and understands all mysteries and all knowledge, and though he has all faith so that he can remove mountains, and though he bestows all his goods to feed the poor, and in a mistaken zeal would give even his body to be burned, yet if he has not charity, if he will not allow others the privilege of free thought which he claims for himself, if, while he admits the rectitude of the life, he denies the purity of the heart, he is nothing, he does not imitate Jesus Christ and his apostles, and he is only nominally a Christian.

Again, the zeal of the exclusionist is not according to a knowledge of human nature, and of the means by which the interests of the Christian church are to be promoted. It is notorious that men differ, and it is admitted that they must differ very much in their intellectual notions; that some have a quick and others a slow perception of truth; that some are so extremely dull of apprehension, and this dullness is so increased by their education, that the clearest arguments you can address to them do not weigh with them a feather — very good men, doubtless, but, it may be, very obstinate men, for according as a man is more dull he is generally more obstinate. These men have made up their minds, on very weak grounds perhaps, but still they have made them up. They think they are right, and perhaps they are as right as it is possible for *such* men to be. Now we say that such men must have different opinions from men of clear minds, who exercise fairly their understandings, unless indeed they agree with them by accident; and what shall we say of such men? If they are leading good lives, but differ entirely from us about certain dogmas of the church, shall we call them enemies of God? No! let us rather say, with the generosity of the Apostle, Him that is weak in the faith receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations.

But we go farther than this, we say that men of the clearest minds and with the strongest love of the truth must differ from one another in their conclusions. It is a fact that such men do differ upon other subjects which do not admit of actual demonstration. Upon religion, then, they must differ too, unless we suppose the natural operations of their minds are here suspended by a miracle. The Christian religion comes before them like any other philosophical subject, and its

agreeableness to truth, to human nature, to the character of God is to be tested by the principles of a true philosophy, is to be tested by the reason of man, to which it is submitted; hence we say that honest men will differ in their interpretation of the Bible, unless by a miracle they are shielded from the errors and prejudices of education, and the thousand imperceptible influences which sway the mind. Still, if they are honest men and devout men, they will find all needful truth; for the promise is, if we seek we shall find, and if we believe him who made the promise we ought to be satisfied.

Those people, then, who will be content with nothing less than the prostration of the religious liberty of others to an implicit obedience to their own convictions, should reflect that they are doing all they can to subvert the only foundation on which worship can be acceptable, namely, the heartfelt, sincere devotion of a conscientious believer. They should reflect that though they gain their object, they gain it at a fearful price. They gain it at the expense of truth. They gain it by filling the church with men who have given up the noblest privilege of their nature, the exercise of their own reason. They gain it by filling the church with hypocrites, and making truth and honesty contemptible. Even allowing that you hold the truth, that you hold it without the least admixture of error, as pure as the word of God itself, yet if, after the most diligent and devout examination and the earnest prayer to be enlightened, your neighbour cannot be convinced that you hold it, were he to adopt your conclusions when his convictions were all the other way, he would be guilty of flagrant impiety. Nothing could justify such an implicit faith against honest convictions, but a supernatural illumination of his mind, which would be nothing else but the presentation of evidence, to which the mind must always submit, and which hitherto it could not find. There is no sin in involuntarily embracing error. There would be sin in voluntarily embracing truth while convinced that that truth was error. It is, then, a most strange and sad inconsistency into which many persons fall who will excuse their fellow-men for errors which they involuntarily embrace upon all other subjects, but if in religion they involuntarily adopt them or are suspected of adopting them, they are denounced as enemies of God, are held up to the scorn of the community, branded with injurious and calumnious epithets, and denied the charities of life.

Again, the zeal of the exclusionist is not according to a

knowledge of God. He is ignorant of his merciful character and of the grounds of acceptance with him. In stating these grounds, he proposes a creed which, however sincerely he thinks it may be drawn from Scripture, other men, who have an equal respect for the Bible and are equally anxious to be saved, cannot find there. The texts upon which this creed is founded they consider as teaching a very different doctrine, and therefore they cannot conscientiously subscribe to it. But they say, laying their hand upon the Bible, "This is my creed. I rest upon this as upon a rock. I will subscribe to anything this teaches me, but then you must allow me to judge for myself what it teaches; and for the manner, the spirit, the motives with which I examine it I am answerable not to you but to God. I wish we could agree in our interpretation, but it would be sin in either of us to side with the other unless we could do so conscientiously." But to this language the exclusionist is deaf, and here he mistakes the grounds of acceptance. He is right in laying much stress upon what he believes are correct doctrines, but then he is wrong in preferring his creed to the Bible. He does not go far enough. He should go so far as to admit that if it had been essential that men should think alike upon the five points of Calvinism for instance, God would certainly have produced this uniformity in every diligent searcher after the truth, but that he has made the grounds of acceptance very different. And then he should open the Bible, and assent to the words of the Saviour and his apostles: "Verily I say unto you, He that believeth on me hath everlasting life"; "Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him and he in God." He should admit that it is purity of heart and patient continuance in well-doing, that it is seeking to exalt our moral nature, which will admit us to that heaven where we shall see God face to face and know even as we are known.

We have thus endeavoured to show that there may be a zeal for God not according to knowledge. We need not say that the attempts to fetter thought have always been disastrous. When *we* insist that others should think as we do, we are guilty of the same blind intolerance which has disgraced and wounded the church in former ages; we are governed by the same spirit which has always led the leaders of a dominant party to oppress those who honestly dissented from their views; we say, we have read the Bible

carefully and these doctrines are written on its pages as with a sunbeam. The Roman Catholic, relying on the infallibility of his church, said the same, and hence the horrors of the inquisition; but did not other Christians abhor the doctrine of transubstantiation as an impious heresy? Calvin said the same, and burnt Servetus at a slow fire of green wood; but how many shrunk from the doctrine of unconditional election, and how few at the present day would dare to take the creed of Calvin as he wrote it, without the most material modification! and yet he believed it to be fundamental and essential to salvation. And after all the blood that has been shed, and the fierce quarrels which have sundered states and families, on the plea of love to God, is it not time that men ceased this most unchristian spirit, and left to others to read the Bible quietly for themselves?

More than eighteen centuries have elapsed since Jesus Christ proclaimed peace on earth, good will to men. Temples dedicated to his religion have been and are still planted throughout the civilized world, and it is certainly natural to suppose that the Christian world understands better the spirit of its Master, and is anxious to help on the reign of peace and brotherly love. But is it so? Are those who call themselves Christians willing to sit at Jesus's feet and learn of him, and to treat with the same leniency as he did those who are sinners and who are erring disciples? We are constrained to say with sorrow, that though there may be a very great improvement in this respect, yet there is still a spirit of unholy opposition among disciples of the same Master, claiming to follow in his footsteps. They have a zeal for God indeed, but it is not according to knowledge. We are pointed to what are called revivals of religion, and we gladly bear their authors record that they have been zealous in the cause of Christ, but have they all been revivals of pure and undefiled religion? We fear not, we fear that they have created in a great degree an unnatural thirst for excitement, that they have taken people to the church, when they might better have learned piety at home, that they have revived and fanned into a flame the fire of sectarian zeal, and that many have become sharp polemists without becoming better Christians.

Churches are rising up all around us, but this is not necessarily a proof that they are all raised in the spirit of a calm and devoted piety, nor based upon that foundation which alone can be laid permanently, the foundation of which Jesus Christ

is the chief corner-stone, elect and precious. We should rejoice with joy unspeakable if we could believe that all churches in our land maintained a cordial fellow-feeling for each other, and would acknowledge that though they read the Scriptures with different interpretations, yet they all searched them diligently, prayerfully, and with a sincere love of the truth; that though they differed about the person of Christ, they were all agreed as to his character, all loved and sought his instructions, and all desired to imitate his example; that though they had different forms of worship, they had the same spirit, and desired to lead a holy life, relying not on their own merits but on the free grace of God. If we could believe that every church was filled with this spirit, we should rejoice at their multiplication. But we still hear around us the voice of intolerance; and as one sect gains or thinks it gains a single step, it is often flushed with the triumph, not over error and over sin, but simply over opposition.

C. A. Farley.

Saint-Simon.

1. *Doctrine de Saint-Simon. Exposition. Première Année.* 1828–1829. 8vo. pp. 432. Troisième edition. Revue et Augmentée. Paris. 1831.

2. *Doctrine Saint-Simonienne. Résumé général de l'Exposition faite en* 1828 *et* 1829. Extrait de *la Revue Encyclopédique.* 8vo. pp. 45. Deuxième edition. Paris. 1831.

3. *Religion Saint-Simonienne. Enseignement Central.* Extrait de *l'Organisateur.* 8vo. pp. 64. Paris. 1831.

4. *Lettre à M. le Président de la Chambre des Députés.* 8vo. pp. 8. Paris. Octobre 1, 1830.

[1. *Doctrine of Saint-Simon. Exposition. First Year.* 1828–9. Third edition, revised and enlarged.

2. *Saint-Simonian Doctrine. General Summary of the Exposition made in* 1828–9. From the *Revue Encyclopédique.* Second edition.

3. *Saint-Simonian Religion. Central Instruction.* From *l'Organisateur.*

4. *Letter to the President of the Chamber of Deputies.*]

Everybody has heard of the Saint-Simonians, a new sect of philosophers, politicians, and religionists which a few years ago appeared in France. They made much noise and attracted no little attention for a time, by the novelty of some of their notions, and by the enthusiasm with which they supported them. It is said, how truly we know not, that they have latterly run into many wild and mischievous extravagancies, and that the day of their glory is past. However this may be, they have left indelible traces of their new system on the philosophical and religious opinions of France; and since they are now making their appearance in England, and since we have seen it stated that they intend visiting this country, we have thought it not too late to be both interesting and profitable to give a more detailed account of their doctrines than is within the reach of our readers generally. In this article, however, we can do little more than furnish some notices of Saint-Simon himself, the prophet of the sect, which we collect almost entirely from the works before us.

Claude Henri Saint-Simon, son of the Duc de Saint-Simon, the author of the "Memoirs," was born April 17, 1760, of one of the noble families of France, which traces its descent, through the Counts of Vermandois, from Charlemagne. He had early a presentiment of his destined greatness, and from the age of seventeen he caused himself to be awakened in the morning with the words, "Get up, Count, you have great things to do." His heated imagination presented before him the royal founder of his family, who foretold to him that to the glory of having produced a great monarch should be added through him that of producing a great philosopher.

He entered the military service at seventeen, and the year after came into this country, where he made five campaigns with distinction, under the orders of Bouillié and Washington. He became acquainted with Franklin, and studied the political organization of our United States; for while here he busied himself much more with political science than with military tactics, for which he had no great fondness. It is from this period that he dates his philosophic tendency. "The war" [of the American revolution], he says, "in itself did not interest me; but its object interested me very much,

and this enabled me to support its labours without repugnance. 'I will the end,' I often said, 'I should then will the means.' But my disgust for the trade of arms was complete, so soon as I saw peace approach. From that moment I saw clearly what was to be my future career. My vocation was not to be a soldier. I was carried to a very different and, I may say, an opposite kind of activity. To study the developement of the human mind, and afterwards to labour to perfect civilization, — such was the object I proposed to myself, and to which I devoted myself without repose, consecrating to it my whole life. This new kind of activity began then to engross all my powers. The remainder of my stay in America was employed in meditating on the great events I had witnessed, in seeking to discover their causes and to foresee their results. I saw then that the American revolution must signalize a new political era, necessarily determine an important progress in general civilization, and cause great changes in the social order then existing in Europe."

Scarcely had he returned to Europe when he was called upon to witness the breaking out of the French revolution. This spectacle, at once magnificent and terrible, could not fail to affect him deeply; but looking beyond the vulgar horizon, into the future as well as into the past, he was able to distinguish its causes and to appreciate its results. He saw in this grand event the practical application of the theories founded by the reformers in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and popularised by the philosophers in the eighteenth century, — the legitimate destruction of a moral and social order which no longer responded to the interests and the sentiments of society; and at the same time he saw that this crisis, called to prepare the soil for the seed, contained in itself no germ of reörganization, and that it could be definitively terminated only by the production of a new principle of social classification. To discover this principle, bring it out, and establish it, was what he considered his mission. He viewed the French revolution as having only a destructive mission, — necessary, important, but incomplete for humanity; and therefore, instead of being carried away by its current, as were nearly all whose sympathies were like his, he applied himself to the accumulation of the materials required for the erection, on the ruins of the old, of a new social edifice, to remain, to improve in beauty, grandeur, strength, and symmetry forever.

His first care was to procure the pecuniary resources neces-

sary for his work. To this end he engaged in some immense financial speculations, which were crowned with great success. "I desired fortune," he said, "only as the means of organizing a grand industrial establishment, to found a school to perfect science, in a word, to contribute to the progress of light, and to the melioration of the fate of humanity." The grand establishment was organized, but it failed; and his partner, who did not share his philanthropic, or, as some may say, visionary views, separated from him, much to Saint-Simon's disadvantage, whose ability to manage pecuniary matters, alone, does not seem to have been of the highest order.

However, faithful to the plan he had traced, he employed the feeble remains of his fortune saved from the ruin of the establishment, the attempted industrial and scientific school, to perfect his own scientific education. His object was to introduce into the French school a grand scientific theory which should embrace all the sciences and all the facts of science. But this required preliminary labours. It was necessary to know the actual condition of science and the history of its discoveries. Seven years were devoted to these preliminary labours. He did not confine himself to libraries. He sat down opposite the Polytechnic School; he contracted a friendship with several of its professors, and employed three years with their aid in making himself master of the current knowledge respecting inorganic bodies. Good cheer, good wine, much attention to the professors, to whom his purse was open, seem to have made them communicative, and to have procured him all the facilities he could desire. "I had, however," he says, "great difficulties to surmount. My brain had lost its malleability; I was no longer young. But I enjoyed some advantages, extended travels, the intercourse of able men which I sought and obtained, an early education by d'Alembert, an education which had woven me a metaphysical net so compact that no important fact could pass through it."

After three years, in 1801, he left the Polytechnic School and seated himself near that of Medicine. Here he formed a connexion with the physiologists, and did not leave them till he had obtained a full knowledge of their general ideas on organic bodies. He then visited England, Switzerland, and a part of Germany. "My object," he says, "in going to England was to inform myself whether the English had discovered any new general ideas. I returned, assured that they had upon their stocks no new capital idea." His

opinion of Germany was a little more favourable. "I brought from Germany the conviction that general science was yet in its infancy in that country, since it was there founded on mysticism; but I conceived a hope of its ultimate progress, on seeing the whole of that great nation passionately engaged in a scientific direction."

Saint-Simon did not content himself with studying the sciences and the learned; he wished to know artists and their inspirations, and to compare their genius with that of scientific speculators. His house, thus, for a year, became the resort of the most distinguished men in Paris of both classes. Seven years had now been employed in forming an acquaintance with the various branches of human knowledge, and he felt himself able to draw up an inventory of the scientific wealth of Europe.

But now commenced his severest trials, his greatest labours. His fortune, shaken by the failure of the "grand establishment", was wholly dissipated by his pursuit after knowledge. His friends deserted him. From this time he must live in want, in suffering, in humiliation. He must remain *alone with the consciousness of what he is*, and for a long time this consciousness proved itself able to sustain his courage. His first occupation was to recast philosophy. Napoleon had said to the Institute, "Give me an account of the progress of science since 1789. Tell me what is the actual state of science, and what are the means necessary to make it advance." The Institute replied to this magnificent question merely by a series of partial, historical reports, which being tied together by no general view could give to science no real impulse. Saint Simon undertook to remedy this defect. He conceived and executed his "*Introduction aux Travaux Scientifiques du XIXe Siècle*," in two volumes quarto, a great work, in which he deposited the germ of most of the ideas he afterwards developed. In this work he demonstrates for the human race what Bacon had for the individual, that intellectual activity has two general, alternate modes of operation, *analysis* and *synthesis*, the mode *à priori*, and the mode *à posteriori;* he makes it appear that science, considered in the assemblage of all the men who cultivate it passes successively, but at distant intervals of time, from *analysis* to *synthesis*, from the search after facts to the construction of theories; that the greatest step which the human mind can be made to take in the direction of the sciences is to determine the proper time to pass from one mode to the other; he takes it upon him to

prove that the learned of Europe, for a century engaged in the paths of analysis, have sufficiently explored them, and that they ought to abandon them for a general or synthetic point of view. In a word, he required the learned to return to the point of view of Des Cartes, which they had entirely forgotten for that of Newton. "Des Cartes," he says to them, "had monarchized science. Newton republicanized it, he *anarchized it.* You are only learned anarchists, you deny the existence, the supremacy of a general theory." He afterwards enumerated the principal conceptions of the learned during the 17th and 18th centuries, particularly that of Condorcet on the progressive developement of the human race. He furnished the means for the study of this developement, a study elevated by him to the rank of a positive science. The learned did not regard him, but the future will comprehend him.

But it was chiefly in reference to a social and political end that he sought to stimulate the zeal of the learned. The destructive wars which followed the French revolution made him feel every day more vividly the necessity of reörganizing a general doctrine and a central European power. Preöccupied, as he was at this epoch, with the importance of the sciences, it was to the scientific that he addressed himself to realize his project. He wished to elevate them to the height of such a mission. "From the 15th century up to this day," he says to them, "the institution which united the European nations, and curbed the ambition of people and of kings, has been successively enfeebled. It is now completely destroyed. A general war, a fearful war, a war which threatens to devour the whole European population, has already existed for twenty years and harvested many millions of men. You alone can reörganize European society. Time presses — blood flows — hasten to declare yourselves." But he spoke in vain. The learned were as little moved by the anarchy of Europe as by the anarchy of science. Saint-Simon did not know, at this moment, that it was from HIMSELF ALONE must proceed the doctrine and the men capable of reëstablishing unity, order, harmony.

The year eighteen hundred and fourteen arrives. Always ardent to pursue under the most suitable form the object from which he never in any circumstances allowed himself to be diverted, he abandons the direction essentially speculative, which till now he has followed, to engage in political labours. He soon perceives the new character which the devel-

opement of industry must impart to society and to the forms of government. He speaks no longer, as before, to the learned. He turns to the industrious classes, and devotes ten years to the work of making them comprehend the new social rank they are destined to hold. He writes and publishes successively several works, but they produced no great sensation. He who labours for the industrious classes does nobly, but he must not expect to be very readily comprehended nor very cordially thanked. But let no one on this account desert them. They curse the hand that would unloose their fetters, only because they fear its design is to rivet them firmer. At this period of his life Saint-Simon presents himself in a touching attitude. He lived in poverty, in want, in neglect. He laboured incessantly, in his own opinion for the good of his fellow-beings; yet no one thanked him; no one aided him; no one cheered him onward; but all united in loading him with obloquy and abuse. "These fifteen days," he writes, "I have lived on bread and water. I have laboured without fire. I have sold everything, even to my wearing apparel, to defray the expense of some copies of my work. It is the passion for science and public happiness, it is the desire to find the means for terminating, in a gentle manner, the fearful crisis in which all European society is engaged, that has plunged me into this distress. It is therefore without a blush that I avow my wants, and solicit the assistance needed to put me in a condition to continue my work."

One day, one single day, in this terrible situation, scorned and abandoned by the very men for whom his life was a perpetual sacrifice, his courage fails him. He doubts his mission; he is in despair; he asks, he wills, he seeks to die. His hand is armed against himself; the ball grazes his forehead. "But his hour is not yet come." His work must not be left incomplete. He has created a philosophy of the sciences, a philosophy of industry; he must live long enough to find the religion destined to unite the two creations. He must now be the prophet of the law of love. "God," say his disciples, in apostrophizing him, "God has left thee to fall only to prepare thee for a still grander initiation; and see, from the bottom of the abyss he raises thee, exalts thee even to himself. He sheds over thee the religious inspiration which vivifies, sanctifies, renews thy whole being. Henceforth it is no longer the learned man, no longer the workingman, that speaks. A hymn of love escapes from his mutilated body. THE DIVINE MAN IS MANIFEST. 'New Christianity' is

given to the world! — Moses *promised* to mankind universal brotherhood; Jesus Christ *prepared* it; Saint-Simon *realizes* it. The Church *really* Universal is about to be born. The reign of Cæsar ends; a pacific takes the place of a military society; and the Universal Church governs the temporal as well as the spiritual, in the outer as well as in the inner court. Science is holy, industry is holy, for they seem to improve the condition of the poorest classes and to bring them near to God. Priests, the learned, the industrious, these are the whole society; chiefs of the priests, chiefs of the learned, chiefs of the industrious, these are the whole government. And all *good* is the *good* of the church, and every profession is a religious function, a grade in the social hierarchy. To each one according to his capacity, to each capacity according to its works. The reign of God is at hand. All prophecies are fulfilled. Saint-Simon, now thou mayest die, for THOU HAST DONE GREAT THINGS."

Saint-Simon closed his career with his religious work called "*New Christianity.*" He died the 19th of May, 1825, in obscurity, in want, attended by his only disciple, who received his last revelations and who became the chief of the sect. If we may believe his disciples, Saint-Simon was a man of exalted worth. His only passion, according to them, was the public good. Liberty, industry, philosophy in all that it has of the sublime were the constant themes of his meditations. He had an almost unequalled nobleness of soul and of sentiment. His conversation was clear, lively, brilliant, able in a few hours to make perceptible and palpable, ideas which it would require volumes fully to develope. He never talked of himself. He discarded all the factitious distinctions of society, and shone by himself alone, by the man that was in him. His genius was great, but his heart was greater. All his ideas passed through his heart. He was never known to complain of a single human being, although he had made many ingrates. He had an inconceivable simplicity of manner, always seized the tone and placed himself within the reach of the one who enjoyed his conversation; and such was his flexibility of mind that while the wisest carried away the hope of returning to profit by his conversation, the ignorant left him with the idea that they had instructed him. He was lavish of his thoughts, cared not who profited by them, provided they were diffused. It was his delight to collect around him young men, the men of the future, and to procure them the means of opening to

themselves an honourable career by their labours or their writings. No selfishness was discovered to sully the beauty of his character. He knew how to acquire wealth, had acquired it more than once, but his regard for the interests of others and little care for his own made him diffuse it faster than he could obtain it. "If there were not generosity in the heart," said he, "it would always be a good calculation."

His enemies, indeed, allege many things against him. The most important is that he was a very troublesome beggar. His disciples do not deny the charge; they allege that it was his desire to do mankind good that reduced him to beggary. They, however, do not pretend that he was perfect. They consider him not as the type of perfection, but of an eternal progress towards perfection. They see in him an advance prophetic of the advance of humanity. They think he ascended high the ladder whose steps, through the infinite, lead up to God. He leaped an immense chasm, and now lends a helping hand to his disciples to leap the same, and to place themselves by his side. He ended a thousand times greater than he began; and death does not interrupt his eternal progress. "Great God!" say his disciples, "he is and always will be before thy face; he is and always will be *with us, in us.* It will always be by him that we shall develope ourselves and make our way to thee. The being of Saint-Simon, growing more and more perfect, is at each moment made up of all that we can conceive of love, of wisdom, and beauty under a human form. It is to the being composed of these that our worship, our admiration, and our souls are devoted. Old religions, wholly *stationary,* have the type of what they reverence in the past; our religion, wholly *progressive,* places it in the future; and one of the finest results of our progress is that we every day become able to represent our type to ourselves under a more attracting and a more perfect form."

This may be a little mystical to those of our readers who have long had thinking made easy to them. It is not the *man* they worship. It is not the man Saint-Simon they reverence. They pay their homage to the progress he manifested, to the truths he disclosed, and to the passionate love of humanity which controled him. They revere him as a model for them to imitate only in his progress, and in the object towards which he directed his labours. They do not look at him as he was in the past, to see what they should be; they

look at him where his continued progress has elevated him, and thus gather strength to press onward and upward after him.

With the Saint-Simonians everything is progress, everything changes to man's conception as he advances. God enlarges, becomes pure, wise, and beautiful, in proportion as the mind that contemplates him enlarges, becomes pure, clothed with wisdom, and adorned with beauty. This idea is undoubtedly just. The God of the ignorant is not the God of the enlightened. Every man has a God of his own, exactly proportioned to his degree of mental and moral progress. That which a man worships is always the highest worth of which he can form any conception. The negro ascribes to his ill-shapen *fétiche* the highest excellence he can conceive, and you must enlarge his mental and moral capacity before he can worship a God of higher and more moral attributes. You change not the object of man's worship by changing the name of his God. The Jew, who ascribed to his Jehovah no higher qualities than the Greeks did to Jupiter, was no more a worshipper of the true God than they. The same is true of the Christian. If mankind worship the true God now any more than formerly, it is because there has been an advance, because the human mind has grown and become able to take in the idea of a purer, sublimer, and more beautiful Divinity.

We delight to apply this thought to Christianity somewhat as the Saint-Simonians apply it to their prophet. Christianity is to every Christian the type of moral and religious perfection; but that type varies in different ages, in different individuals, and even in the same individual at different epochs of his life. Christianity, in the minds of those who embraced it in the early centuries, was a low thing to what it is now. No matter what it was in the mind of its Author; where it was embraced it was measured not by his mind, but by the minds of those who embraced it. It can never in any mind mean a greater degree of moral and religious perfection than that mind is capable of receiving, understanding, appreciating. There must be almost an infinite difference between Milton's Christianity and that of the Abbé Paris. Still, one was a Christian, as well as the other. One age, one sect is Christian, as well as another, when compared with itself. Each is modelled after the same type, each takes in the highest worth of which it can form any conception. But the type stands for an amount exactly proportioned to the progress which has been made. Christianity, then, can never be outgrown. We may pursue

an eternal career of progress, and at each step will the term Christianity enlarge its meaning, and the word Christ designate purer, lovelier, sublimer worth!

But to return. Saint-Simon, viewed as he may be, was undoubtedly no ordinary man. His views are those of no ordinary mind. They bear the stamp of originality, of a mind in pursuit of variety, in love with the beautiful, and, in its own estimation, wedded to humanity, and longing to redeem, exalt, and make it happy and forever more happy. We have dwelt long upon his career, perhaps too long for the patience of our readers; but we delight to trace such a character, we find instruction in its very extravagancies. We shall take up his system as developed by his disciples, as we find time and room.

O. A. Brownson.

The Athanasian Creed.

A correspondent suggests the publication in this journal of the *Athanasian Creed*, so called,— a formulary which in this country is more frequently heard of than met with. This creed, we would remind our readers, is set forth as containing the doctrine of the Churches of England and Rome concerning the Trinity. In the eighth Article of the Church of England it is declared that it "ought thoroughly to be received and believed"; and the Rubrick of this Church commands that "Upon these Feasts, Christmas-day, the Epiphany, Saint Matthias, Easter-day, Ascension-day, Whitsunday, Saint John Baptist, Saint James, Saint Bartholomew, Saint Matthew, Saint Simon and Saint Jude, Saint Andrew, and upon Trinity-Sunday, shall be sung or said at Morning Prayer, this Confession of our Christian Faith, by the Minister and people standing." We present it as found in The Book of Common Prayer.

Whosoever will be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic Faith. Which Faith except everyone do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly.

And the Catholic Faith is this: That we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity; neither confounding the Persons, nor dividing the Substance.

For there is one Person of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Ghost. But the Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, is all one, the Glory equal, the Majesty co-eternal.

Such as the Father is, such is the Son, and such is the Holy Ghost. The Father uncreate, the Son uncreate, and the Holy Ghost uncreate. The Father incomprehensible, the Son incomprehensible, and the Holy Ghost incomprehensible. The Father eternal, the Son

eternal, and the Holy Ghost eternal. And yet they are not three eternals, but one eternal. As also there are not three incomprehensibles, nor three uncreated; but one uncreated, and one incomprehensible.

So likewise the Father is Almighty, the Son Almighty, and the Holy Ghost Almighty. And yet there are not three Almighties, but one Almighty.

So the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God. And yet they are not three Gods, but one God.

So likewise the Father is Lord, the Son Lord, and the Holy Ghost Lord. And yet not three Lords, but one Lord.

For like as we are compelled by the Christian verity to acknowledge every Person by himself to be God and Lord, so are we forbidden by the Catholic Religion to say, There be three Gods, or three Lords.

The Father is made of none; neither created nor begotten. The Son is of the Father alone; not made, nor created, but begotten. The Holy Ghost is of the Father and of the Son; neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding. So there is one Father, not three Fathers; one Son, not three Sons; one Holy Ghost, not three Holy Ghosts.

And in this Trinity none is afore or after other; none is greater or less than another; but the whole three Persons are co-eternal together and co-equal. So that in all things, as is aforesaid, the Unity in Trinity and the Trinity in Unity is to be worshipped. He therefore that will be saved must thus think of the Trinity.

Furthermore, it is necessary to everlasting salvation that he also believe rightly the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ.

For the right Faith is, that we believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and Man; God, of the Substance of the Father, begotten before the worlds, and Man, of the Substance of his Mother, born in the world; Perfect God and Perfect Man; of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting; Equal to the Father, as touching his Godhead, and inferior to the Father, as touching his manhood. Who although he be God and Man, yet he is not two, but one Christ; one not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by taking of the Manhood into God; one altogether; not by confusion of Substance, but by unity of Person. For as the reasonable soul and flesh is one Man, so God and Man is one Christ; Who suffered for our salvation, descended into hell, rose again the third day from the dead. He ascended into heaven, he sitteth on the right hand of the Father, God Almighty; from whence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead. At whose coming all men shall rise again with their bodies, and shall give account for their own works. And they that have done good shall go into life everlasting; and they that have done evil into everlasting fire.

This is the Catholic Faith; which except a man believe faithfully, he cannot be saved.

We think we do not venture much in the assertion that pen (we will not say *mind)* never framed such another tissue of utter nonsense as is contained in this creed. For ourselves we are free to confess that we never rise from its perusal but with the conviction that it is impossible to conceive a

more violent outrage upon language, or more downright mockery of the understanding. Christianity, how have thy friends wronged thee! Are thy triumphs few, thy contemners many? With this for thy banner, thyself wouldst shrink from triumph. Thus disfigured, thyself wouldst feel honour to be dishonour.

The following versification of the above creed we have chanced to meet with in an old collection of Psalms, printed in 1633,* and subjoined to a copy of King James's Bible bearing the same date.

What man soeuer he be, that
saluation will attaine:
The Catholike beliefe he must,
before all things retaine.
Which faith vnlesse he holy keepe,
and vndefiledly:
Without all doubt eternally,
he shall be sure to dye.

The Catholike beliefe is this,
that God we worship one
In Trinity, and Trinity
in vnity alone,
So as we neither doe confound
the person of the three:
Nor yet the substance whole of one,
in sundry parted be.

One person of the Father is,
another of the Sonne:
Another person proper of
the holy Ghost alone.
Of Father, Sonne, and holy Ghost,
but one the Godhead is:
Like glory coeternall eke,
the Maiesty likewise.

Such as the Father is, such is
the Sonne in each degree:
And such also we do beleeue,
the holy Ghost to be.

Vncreate is the Father, and
vncreate is the Sonne:
The holy Ghost vncreate, so
vncreate is each one.

Incomprehensible Father is,
incomprehensible Sonne:
Incomprehensible also is
the holy Ghost of none.
The Father is eternall, and
the Sonne eternall so:
And in like sort eternall is
the holy Ghost also.

And yet though we beleeue, that
of these eternall be, [each
Yet there but one eternall is,
and not eternals three:
As ne incomprehensible, we,
ne yet vncreate three:
But one incomprehensible, one,
vncreate hold to be.

Almighty so the Father is,
the Sonne Almighty so:
And in like sort Almighty is
the holy Ghost also.
And albeit that euery one
of these Almighty be:
Yet there but one Almighty is,
and not Almighties three.

---

* For the benefit of the curious we present the title of the collection here referred to.

"The Booke of Psalmes, collected into English Meeter, by Thomas Sternhold, Iohn Hopkins, and others: conferred with the Hebrew, with apt Notes to sing them withall. Set forth and allowed to be sung in all Churches, of all the People together, before and after Morning and Euening prayer. As also before and after Sermons, and moreouer in priuate Houses, for their godly solace and comfort, laying apart all vngodly Songs, and Ballads, which tend onely to the nourishing of vice, and corrupting of Youth. Colossians iii. *Let the Word of God dwell plenteously in you in all wisedome, teaching and exhorting one another in Psalmes, Hymnes, and spirituall Songs, and sing vnto the Lord in your hearts.* Iames v. *If any be afflicted, let him pray: if any be merry, let him sing Psalmes.* London, Imprinted by I. L. for the Company of Stationers. 1633. *Cum priuilegio.*"

The Father God is, God the Sonne,
God holy Ghost also:
Yet are there not three Gods at all,
but one God and no moe.
So likewise Lord the Father is,
and Lord also the Sonne:
And Lord the holy Ghost, yet are
there not three Lords, but one.

For as we are compeld to grant
by Christian verity:
Each of the persons by himselfe,
both God and Lord to be.
So Catholike Religion
forbiddeth vs alway:
That either Gods be three, or that
there Lords be three to say.

Of none the Father is, ne made,
ne create nor begot:
The Sonne is of the Father, not
create, ne made, but got.
The holy Ghost is of them both,
the Father and the Sonne:
Ne made, ne create, nor begot,
but doth proceed alone.

So we one Father hold, not three,
one Sonne also, not three:
One holy Ghost alone, and not
three holy Ghosts to be.
None in this Trinitie before,
nor after other is:
Ne greater any than the rest,
ne lesser be likewise.

But euery one among themselues,
of all the persons three:
Together coeternall all,
and all coequall be.
So Vnitie in Trinitie,
as said it is before:
And Trinitie in Vnitie,
in all things we adore.

Therefore what man soeuer that
saluation will attaine,
This faith touching the Trinitie,
of force he must retaine.
And needfull to eternall life,
it is that euery wight,
Of the incarnating of Christ,
our Lord, beleeue aright.

For this the right faith is, that we
beleeue and eke doe know,
That Christ our Lord the Sonne of
is God and man also. [God,

God of his Fathers substance got,
before the world began:
And of his Mothers substance borne,
in world a very man.

Both perfect God and perfect man,
in one, one Iesus Christ:
That doth of reasonable soule,
and humane flesh subsist.
Touching his Godhead equall with
his Father God is he;
Touching his Manhood lower than
his Father in degree.

Who though he be both very God,
and very man also,
Yet is he but one Christ alone,
and is not persons two.
One, not by turning of Godhead
into the flesh of man:
But by taking Manhood to God,
this being one began.

All one, not by confounding of
the substance into one:
But onely by the Vnity,
that is of one person.
For as the reasonable soule
and flesh but one man is:
So in one person God and Man,
is but one Christ likewise.

Who suffered for to saue vs all,
to Hell he did descend:
The third day rose againe from
to heauen he did ascend: [death,
He sits at the right hand of God,
the Almighty Father there:
From thence to iudge the quicke and
againe he shall retire. [dead,

At whose returne all men shall rise,
with bodies new restor'd:
And of their owne workes they shall
account vnto the Lord. [giue
And they vnto eternall life
shall goe that haue done well:
Who hath done ill, shall goe into
eternall fire to dwell.

This is the Catholike beliefe,
who doth not faithfully
Beleeue the same, without all doubt
he saued cannot be.
To Father, Sonne, and holy Ghost,
all glory be therefore:
As in beginning was, is now,
and shall be euermore.

Our readers will readily agree with us that this old specimen of versification contains at least quite as much of poetry as does the original of common sense. N.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Instructions for Young Christians. By Lyman Beecher, D. D. Cincinnati. pp. 86.

This is a small volume which has been published by Dr. Beecher since his removal from this neighbourhood. It appears to be the object of the work to correct certain erroneous notions which prevail in the Orthodox part of the community in regard to the nature and effects of the change by which one becomes truly religious. The book is divided into three chapters. The first two are occupied in showing what religion, when it gains a seat in the soul, does not do; the third in showing what it does accomplish. Having thus introduced this book to our readers, we will quote from its pages somewhat at length, that they may learn in what manner the Doctor talks to his brethren in the faith, in regard to certain notions which we have ever regarded as erroneous.

In regard to the notions which have called forth the book the Doctor says:

"There is, from some cause, a general expectation that religion, at its first commencement in the soul, will be indicated by a degree and distinctness of feeling altogether above what will ordinarily be experienced. It is expected that some things will pass away which never will pass away; and that some new things will appear which will never be realized."—pp. 7, 8.

He proceeds to notice some things which religion does not do, though they are things which it is generally expected to accomplish.

"1. Religion accomplishes no change in respect to natural faculties or personal identity.

"Something almost like this is often expected. And when a change is experienced which cometh not with observation, and whose reality and greatness is evinced by silent tranquillity and humble love and cheerful resignation and implicit reliance on the Saviour and a spirit of new obedience, it is something so different from what was anticipated by the subjects of the change, that their very tranquillity alarms them, and the impossibility of exciting fear makes them afraid."—pp. 8, 9.

"2. Religion does not change the natural temperament.

"If a man was ardent before his conversion, he will be so afterward; and if he was phlegmatic, though religion may add a powerful stimulus, it will never make him quick and ardent."—pp. 11, 12.

"3. No change is accomplished by religion in the instincts, passions,

and appetites, excepting that which is indirect, and which consists in their subjugation to the laws of evangelical temperance.

"Nor does that inordinate power of appetite or passion, which is the result of habit, cease of course, without watchfulness, selfdenial, and prayer. Religion in the soul is not an instantaneous omnipotence, putting down, in a moment, all insurrection in the heart, and suspending, in a moment, the bias of every passion which may have become inordinate by indulgence. It comes to aid the man enslaved by sin in regaining his liberty, but not to give it to him without prayer and energetic efforts."—pp. 12–14.

"4. The commencement of religion does not extirpate entirely from the soul any one sinful passion or affection which belongs to our common depraved nature.

"It impairs the power of every one, but expels wholly not one. The Canaanite still dwells in the land, and is driven out only by little and little."—pp. 14, 15.

"5. The commencement of religion in the soul does not cause the subject of it to appear to himself to be growing better."—p. 18.

"6. Religion does not produce intuitive knowledge of what is morally right in all cases, or supersede the ordinary modes of obtaining a knowledge of duty by the study of the Bible, and by observation, reflection, and prayer."—p. 27.

"7. Nor does religion prevent the actual doing of that which is sinful.

"Habitual sin it does prevent. No immorality can be persisted in without extinguishing wholly all evidence of Christian character."—pp. 29, 30.

"8. The commencement of religion is not indicated by any exact order or method of divine manifestation."—p. 37.

"9. The existence of religion does not imply the perceived existence, at once, of all the Christian graces."—p. 44.

"10. Nor does the existence of religion enable the Christian to call up at bidding, for his inspection, any particular Christian grace."–p. 47.

"11. It is not to be anticipated, as the result of a saving conversion, that one unvarying state of enjoyment shall mark the Christian course."—p. 53.

"A change of heart consists in new affections. They are holy or benevolent, in opposition to their former limited and selfish nature. Once the subject loved himself more than God, and loved his fellowmen relatively, through the medium of some relation they stood in to himself, and more or less as that relation was near or remote. But a change of heart produces a more comprehensive and impartial benevolence, which, while it does not overlook the family, extends to God, and pervades his kingdom. While it admits the claims of nationality, it does not shut out claims of the world; and while it feels for the interests of time, includes in its desires and plans and efforts the welfare of eternity. It appreciates the importance of the soul, the rights of God, the evil of sin, and the interests of eternity, to which a heart of selfishness is cold and hard and blind.

"Such is the general nature of that holy love which he feels in whom 'old things have passed away and all things have become new.'

"The evidence of a saving change is, therefore, to be looked for in the altered state of our affections towards God, his law, his gospel, his providential government."—pp. 64–66.

"1. In clearer views of the being, presence, and agency of God, and of the reality of his eternal government."—p. 70.

"In connexion with these clearer views is the apprehended importance of divine things." — p. 76.

"2. Another effect of a change of heart is that the moral excellence of divine things, their beauty, and glory, are now perceived as they never had been perceived before, and move the affections as before they never moved them."— p. 79.

"Religion, then, is indicated, at its commencement in the soul, by new objects of supreme regard; by a new rule of moral obligation — the law of God; by new sources of enjoyment, found in love to God and communion with him, in ever active obedience; by new motives to activity, a desire to please God, a benevolent delight in doing good, and a respect to the recompense of reward, made real and efficacious through faith." — pp. 81, 82.

We have quoted more at length than we should have done had it not been that we wished to let Dr. Beecher speak for himself. For ourselves we are thankful that this book has been written, and especially thankful that it was written by Dr. Beecher. It meets directly and is calculated to do away many notions in regard to the nature and effects of the change experienced in becoming religious which, to our knowledge, now prevail in the minds of the great mass of the community. And coming under the sanction of Dr. Beecher's name, it will exert an influence where the same views with some other name would exert no influence whatever. We hope, therefore, that the book will be widely circulated among our Orthodox brethren. Nay more, we would say to those who agree with us in opinion, the perusal of this book may have a good effect upon you. In it you will find much that will enlighten your minds and delight your hearts, while you will find but one or two expressions that would pain any but the most fastidious ear. JASON WHITMAN.

CORRESPONDENCE AND INTELLIGENCE.

DIVINITY SCHOOL OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

DEAR SIR,

IN compliance with your request I will endeavour to furnish you with some account of the Divinity School; of the studies, devotional exercises, societies, and benevolent objects in which we are engaged.

Our studies will be the subject of this letter. They are divided into three general departments, though the division is in a great measure arbitrary.

Instruction is given by Rev. Dr. Ware, in Natural and Revealed Religion, Church History, and Dogmatic Theology; by Rev. Henry Ware, Jr., in Extempore Speaking, the Composition and Delivery of Sermons, and the Duties of the Pastoral Office; by Rev. J. G. Palfrey, in Hebrew, and the Criticism of the Old and New Testaments.

With Dr. Ware each class has one exercise a week. The Junior or lower class commence with Natural Religion; as, for instance, the evi-

dence which nature furnishes of the being and attributes of God; the proofs which we see of a moral government and the soul's immortality; the probability that God would make a special revelation to man; the proof by which such a revelation could be established, if made; the credibility of miracles; the evidence required to attest them; the application of these results to the Christian Religion. At each recitation the subject for the next week is given out, and reference made to the most important works in which it is treated; and at the next exercise each student is called upon to state the result of his inquiries, and should there be any difference of opinion either upon the main question or incidental points, a free discussion takes place, in which anyone present may engage. The studies of this year are so arranged that nearly every exercise has a bearing upon those which follow. Church History is the principal subject in this department for the Middle class, or second year. No particular work is used as a class-book, though Murdock's translation of Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History is put into their hands as a *Manual*.* Dogmatical Theology is the subject for the Seniors, and the exercises are conducted as before. The great object is to have subjects presented in as clear and fair a light as possible; to look into the most able authors on both sides; to give every objection its due weight; and then yield to that side on which the evidence preponderates.

Our exercises with the Professor of Pulpit Eloquence and Pastoral Care are so various in their immediate object, character, and manner of conducting them, that it is not easy to describe them in few words. With him we have exercises in reading and declamation; in learning and applying rules for the composition of sermons; he presides at our weekly meetings for extempore debate; he takes the lead in our weekly devotional meetings; he visits us at our rooms, for the purpose of conversing upon the means of preparing ourselves, in principle and action, in mind and heart, for the duties of our profession; and he gives occasional lectures to the whole school upon the duties of the pastoral office, the feelings with which we should enter upon it, and the habits, dispositions, and characters which we should form, that our services may be useful to man and acceptable to God.

In the department of Biblical Criticism the Junior class have two exercises a week in the New Testament and three in Hebrew. The other two classes have, each, one exercise a week in the New Testament and one in the old. The former is studied in Greek, the latter in Hebrew, Greek, or English, at the option of the student. Griesbach's text is used, and the study of the New Testament occupies three years. No particular commentary is recommended. Rosenmüller is the Manual. Indeed the study of commentaries of any denomination is discouraged, except so far as they may illustrate the text of the Sacred Volume, or throw light upon the state of society, the customs, habits, and doctrines which prevailed in early times. The New Testament in the original language is placed in our hands; we bring to the investigation whatever knowledge or ability we may possess; we free ourselves, as much as possible, from prejudices which may have been previously imbibed; and with prayers to our Heavenly Father for the assistance of his spirit in purifying our hearts and enlightening our minds, convinced that a clean heart and a right spirit are the best of interpreters, we compare text with text, make Scripture comment upon Scripture, apply those rules of interpretation which most commend themselves to our minds, and carry on the investigation, with modesty I trust, but at the same time with confidence in the results to which we may be led, however agreeing or disagreeing with the creeds and opinions of others. Having thus to the best of our ability studied out the lesson assigned, we meet in

* The Institution furnishes each member of the School with the use of several of the most important works in the different branches of Theology, as *Manuals*.

the lecture-room with our professor, who calls upon us to translate paragraph by paragraph. After we have thus translated a passage he gives his interpretation of it, with the reasons upon which it rests; and the way is opened for discussion, if, as is often the case, there should be difference of opinion. In this way the lesson is discussed, passage by passage; and should any critical questions arise in the course of the exercise, which cannot at once be settled, they are put off for farther examination, and taken up again at the following exercise. This is the manner in which it is intended that we should go through the New Testament; and if, as must be the case, we fall short in practice, and fail to realize the advantages which it would seem to promise, it is owing to the imperfection, not of the plan, but of our own characters.

The Old Testament we consider less immediately applicable to us than the New, and study it therefore with a less anxious solicitude. Considering the time and circumstances under which the Jewish Revelation was given and their sacred writings composed, we come to them with the expectation of finding many things which are to have no influence upon our conduct, and many things which we cannot hope to understand or to reconcile. The study of these books and of the language in which they are written takes three lessons a week, the first year;* and one lesson a week, for the last two years. The Middle class begin to attend the lectures upon the Old Testament. Much greater attention is given to some parts than to others. The Pentateuch, for obvious reasons, demands the most particular examination. A certain portion, with the subjects having a bearing upon it, is assigned weekly for our investigation. Jahn's Hebrew Commonwealth and Introduction to the Old Testament, and Rosenmüller's Commentary, are our *Manuals*. In this, as in all our studies, we have in our own building an extensive Theological Library for reference, besides the Library of the University, which is particularly rich in works of Theology. In the lecture-room the Professor gives his own views upon the lesson, and the students ask such questions and make such remarks and objections as occur to them, and, as in all our exercises, a free statement and discussion of opinions are desired. The whole of the Old Testament is not regarded as one work. Each book is made to rest upon its own merits, and each book, with the proofs external and internal upon which its claims are founded, is subjected to a separate examination.

This is a brief outline of the manner in which our studies are conducted. The great object in all is to allow and encourage the utmost freedom of inquiry and debate. Still, it must not be supposed that students here begin the study of long disputed and generally agitated subjects in divinity without bias towards one side rather than the other. The human mind must be formed on a new model before entire impartiality, even at the commencement of such studies, can be realized. The professors of the Cambridge Theological School are not indifferent to the decisions which may be made upon the great subjects that come within their province. No good man, who believes his opinions to be true and important, can be indifferent to their adoption or rejection. Nor can it be said that they take no pains to convince others of what they believe. But how would they convince them? Not, surely, by imposing upon their ignorance. Not by a garbled statement of facts or a one-sided view of arguments. Not by authoritative assertion, or unwarranted assumption; nor by reasons which have no weight in their own minds. They have too much respect for truth to believe that it needs or will tolerate such assistance. They have too much confidence in their opinions to believe that anything more than a manly, pious, rational investigation is necessary for their support. And they so far trust to the judgment and integ-

* In which one quarter part of the Old Testament is included in exercises for the acquisition of the language.

rity of the students, as to believe that, if allowed fairly to try all things, they will hold fast that which is good.

However this may be, if truth will thrive only in the hot-beds of fraud, let it perish. If men can be led to the temple of truth only through the crooked ways of prevarication and deception, let them live in error. Erroneous opinions even, if formed by the free, honest, and enlightened action of the mind and carried into practice with a spirit of meekness and piety, will do more for the regeneration of society, for man's happiness here and hereafter, than true opinions forced upon slavish, ignorant minds, and practised with a spirit of pride and intolerance. We believe that we are more fully discharging our duty both to God and man in *thus* inculcating our doctrines, though converts should be few, than in calling crowds around our standard by less honest means. Truth is important only on account of its influence upon the soul. Christianity is important only on account of its influence upon the soul. If, therefore, truth, nay, if the dearest of all truths — Christianity itself — can be supported only by fettering the soul, by destroying its freedom, by palsying its powers, by making it the slave of prejudice, and thereby tarnishing the lustre of its moral faculties, then truth, Christianity, can be supported only by destroying the very end for which they were designed. They are vain things. Man's nature is a mass of contradictions. His firmest hopes are visionary. His best moral powers are, from the constitution of things, self-murderers; they must work their own ruin. But we are reduced to no such strait. Truth can be acquired only by the free, untrammelled action of the mind. Christianity, in the proofs upon which it leans, in the light by which it is to be illustrated and the light which it communicates, not only allows, but demands, the free, untrammelled action of the mind. Without free mental action its proofs cannot be understood, its character cannot be understood; and, when understood, freedom of mental action — freedom from ignorance, from prejudice, from passion and from sin — is the brightest and the dearest blessing which it gives. With these views, therefore, we take nothing for granted. We come to the study of divinity, not as lawyers, for the purpose of proving particular positions. We come as humble inquirers for the truth. Our first object is, not to build up a bulwark around religion, but to ascertain whether it be true; and this is the first question with respect to every subject that belongs to our studies. After this is settled it is time to look to consequences. He is but a weak-hearted inquirer who dares not search into the truth and proclaim it, lest it should be dangerous to himself or society. He betrays a lamentable distrust both in the wisdom and goodness of his Maker. TRUTH, IN THE SPIRIT OF TRUTH, is the motto which should be stamped upon our banners. Not proselytism, not the formation or enlargement of a sect, not the extension of these or those opinions as watchwords of a party, but the diffusion of truth, in the spirit of truth, the diffusion of the doctrines which Christ taught, in the spirit which Christ exhibited — this is the object for which we would live, to which we would devote whatever of talent, industry, or learning we may possess. The consequences rest with God, and we would cheerfully and confidently leave them in his hands. J. H. M.

Cambridge, May, 1834.

INFIDEL MEETINGS IN BOSTON.

DEAR SIR,

YOU requested me, when I saw you last, to give you some brief account of the Infidel meetings in the city, so far as I might be acquainted with them, and with the views of those who frequent them. All that needs to be said upon the subject can be said in a few words.

It seems that Infidels understand fully the advantages of organization, for, as is probably known to you, there exists in the city an organized body of males and females under the name of "The First Society of Free Inquirers." This is made up of the open and avowed unbelievers in Christianity, who hold meetings every Sabbath afternoon and evening, to listen to what they are pleased to call "Scientific Lectures"; and on "Wednesday evening, with their *families* and *children*," (we copy from their own bills) "they assemble for the healthy and agreeable exercise of dancing and social conversation." I have attended both these performances, and will briefly state my views upon them. A part of the old theatre is generally well filled on Sundays, though you are not to suppose that all who attend are regular members of the Society. The numbers vary much, in the same manner, and probably from the same reasons, as the number of convicts in our jails and prisons. Some, undoubtedly, after sufficient opportunities of forming an opinion, seem to become disgusted with the company or the employment, and hold to their resolutions of keeping clear of it in future. Others, on the contrary, are more fickle in their good purposes, and make regular periodical returns, merely staying long enough to be recognised when they return. I saw, it is true, the countenances of some three or four honest individuals, whom I thought worthy of better company; but the greater part of the audience was composed of the dregs of society.

So much for the audience. If this be a true description of it (and I think no one who has ever been there will presume to question it), you will be at no loss in imagining the sort of instruction to which they came to listen. The lecturer appeared at a distance to be a venerable and serious character, but upon a closer inspection I was satisfied that it would be but a dictate of common prudence to receive his statements with some qualifications, and not till they had been carefully weighed. Apart from his doctrines, I thought him the poorest speaker I had ever heard; and it may be considered a fortunate circumstance that he has not a particle of eloquence to call into his service. The exercises commenced with singing a glee, after which the lecturer read a chapter from the "Bible of Reason," informing his hearers of the great iniquities of the clergy, how they oppressed the poor, and mockingly courted the favour of the rich, how they frightened the more ignorant with foolish stories about a future judgment, and led a lazy and happy life, growing fat upon the credulity of those whom they deceived. All this they did, besides a number of other wicked things, very offensive to the nice conscience of the writer. Besides all this, their worse than useless services were said to cost the nation more than twenty millions annually.

After this extract from the Bible of Reason, — a book, by the by, which seems hardly to have met with the popularity due to the valuable discoveries it contains, — the lecturer went into an account of the reasons which had induced him to come out from the Christians. His life appears to have been a chequered one. From a carpenter he became a Baptist minister, then a Universalist, then an Infidel. I should feel inclined to dispute the propriety of his first change more than that of any subsequent one, and could not but think him a mortifying instance of the same intellectual infirmity which dictated the tradings of the idiot who began the day with a cow and ended it with a pair of green spectacles. He said that while a Christian he was troubled by doubts which he tried to overcome, but found it all in vain. He could not shut his eyes to the mournful fact that Christendom for more than eighteen centuries had been either wilfully or ignorantly deceived; he had made the discovery, and deemed it but the part of an honest man to come out and say so. We presume that if in this stage of his "Inquiries" he had been by any means retarded, he would, for the time being at least, have become a Jew. Never do I remember to have listened to such poor attempts at reasoning, such thin, sophistical, vapoury arguments, as those by which

the lecturer endeavoured to establish his point, that the wise and the good of all ages had been so wofully deceived, that sages and philosophers have for so many centuries been misled themselves, or, what is worse, been guilty of misleading others, and that all the wisdom of the world was locked up in the heads of the few deluded, ignorant, and unprincipled men united under the name of "Free Inquirers." A child of common understanding would have perceived at once the utter nonsense of his reasoning. However, I think he did himself justice; for it is hardly to be supposed that reason will lend its aid to outreason the plainest truths which language can convey and the understanding own and receive. It would have been amusing, were the subject of a less serious nature, to see the air of confidence with which the lecturer brought up the venerable objections against Christianity, so often, so triumphantly, refuted; such, for instance, as the specious but shallow position of Hume, under the shape of the assertion that "it is much more reasonable that men should lie than that a miracle should take place"; or one of those heated denunciations of Cobbett in his veracious history of the Reformation. Equally amusing was the sight of so many stupid countenances, expressing their satisfaction at the scurrilous ribaldry of many a far-fetched jest, or the deriding use of terms which by many are held most sacred. And yet, I say, he did his best. He attacked religion in the only way in which it can be attacked, namely by magnifying the sins of its unworthy professors, and presenting highly coloured pictures of the perversions and unholy wars, with which Christianity is no more chargeable than were the axe and the fagot for the tortures they were made to inflict. Force has aimed many a rude blow against the sacred fane of Christianity; the edicts of tyrants have forbidden its worshippers to own its sanctity; and when its enemies have exhausted every means of violence in vain, internal dissensions have often threatened its entire overthrow; but still it stands. The modern Infidel knows how its strength has been tried, and with all the wisdom which the case admits he resorts to a new species of warfare, or to one which has been least exerted, probably from the reason, that more honest opposers have considered it unfair and base.

You may ask me if I think that the institutions of religion will now be placed in jeopardy. I should say no — that is, no more than the mental capacities of man, his reason and common sense, are in danger. That individual unhappiness must be the result of such proceedings I cannot doubt. But who are to blame but the individuals? If, against the great truths of religion, the invincible arguments which it offers of its truth, the long catalogue of those who have spent their lives in its defence, the venerable succession of sages who have vindicated its claims and unfolded its instructions, besides the plain assertions of those who declare that they have felt its power, — if, against all this, they are willing to receive the foolish, unsustained positions of a man, whose wisdom, by his own account, seems thus far to have consisted in discovering one day that he was most wofully deceived himself, and most ignorantly deceiving others on the day preceding, — then the choice is their own, and they are at liberty to abide by it. G. E. E.

[Some remarks upon the "Assemblies" in the next number.]

REV. PRESIDENT WYLIE, OF BLOOMINGTON COLLEGE, INDIANA.

Our readers will recollect the notice, contained in our February number, of a Discourse pronounced by Dr. Wylie before the Legislature of Indiana. The following extract of a letter from Rev. J. F. Clarke, dated "*Louisville, April* 18, 1834," will be read with much

interest, as affording a specimen of the pulpit-exercises of this remarkable man.

"We had a delightful discourse, a few evenings since, in the First Presbyterian church, from the celebrated Dr. Wylie, of Bloomington, Indiana. The house was crowded with Presbyterians and others. His text was John xvii. 20, 21. 'Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word; that they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me and I in thee, that they also may be one in us; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me.' He began by stating that if any had come expecting to hear an eloquent discourse they would be disappointed; that he had a few plain thoughts, but vitally important, which might be new to some hearers, as they were till lately new to himself; that he might give offence by some things which he should say, but that he held it a solemn duty not to keep back what he believed so important. He then went on to prove that the union spoken of in the text could not be a union of natures, nor a union of grace or mystical union, but that it was one of love and good works. He then declared that it was the plain doctrine of the text that the world would not be converted till Christians united in love and the peaceful performance of moral duties. He spoke of the importance of evangelizing the world, from the temporal happiness and civilization which Christianity always carries with it, and from the higher blessings of spiritual salvation. 'Nature,' said he, 'confirms the truth of the text and teaches that union is strength, disunion weakness. The same truth is taught or implied by Jesus when he says, "Let your light so shine before men that they *seeing your good works* may glorify your Father who is in heaven" In short, until Christians unite in good works, the performance of duty, and lay aside sectarian disputes and enmities, Christ teaches us that men cannot be converted. For after all, doing good is the great end of religion; for what did Christ come, but "to purify unto himself a peculiar people zealous of good works?"'

"He then proceeded to inquire what had actually been done for the conversion of the world in the present age, and frankly professed that truth obliged him to say that very little had been done. He would grant there had been great excitements — a great machinery put in operation — Bible societies, Missionary societies, &c. had been actively engaged — great sums of money raised and expended — much had been done *about* Christianity, but he looked in vain to see what had been done *for* it. He lamented this deeply, but declared that Christians must admit that it was their sin of uncharitableness which caused it. The Lord's hand is not shortened that he cannot save, but our iniquities prevail against us. It was in vain for Christians to expect the world would be converted by a miracle. Granting, which he was by no means disposed to do, that Christianity had been propagated by a constant miracle from the times of the Apostles, — God would not miraculously interpose till man had done his appointed part. Moral influences were to be exerted through moral means, and the most efficacious of these would be an exhibition of Christian holiness in the lives of believers.

"He then proposed, as a remedy for the evils of the church, that Christians should show a greater reverence for the mysteries of religion — that they should not attempt to explain what was incomprehensible — nor dogmatize about those points on which Locke and St. Paul confessed themselves ignorant. 'Mysteries,' said he, 'are unavoidable in revelation as in nature. But let us leave them as we find them, mysteries. Great books have been written on such topics as the Paternity of the Father, and the Filiation of the Son, and the Procession of the Holy Ghost. Doctors of Divinity, and those who wish to be Doctors of Divinity, and those who never will be Doctors of Divinity, are disputing about things which angels dare not look into.' He proposed, as another means of union, a better un-

derstanding of the nature of creeds. For they are generally looked upon as perfectly true in all their parts; but this is claiming an infallibility for them which can belong only to the word of God. He declared that he knew of no creed in the world which he thought perfectly true. Still, many sects looked upon their creed as rather a more faithful guide than the Scriptures.

"He farther spoke of the great evils of sectarianism — of the communion-table, the place appointed by Christ for all Christians to meet in love, made a sectarian bulwark — he condemned with great but due severity the practice of launching bolts against brethren 'up river, or down river,' in the act of prayer, where every man should feel as an humble sinner — he rebuked the narrow and unchristian spirit which refuses to read, hear, or touch anything which has not the stamp and seal of the sect on it — the idolatrous respect paid to the great founders of different sects, who would be much less admired, he said, did we hear as much of their pride and positiveness as we do of their zeal and prayers.

"He concluded by a solemn warning and affectionate appeal to all who heard him to take these truths home and apply them to their own consciences.

"I have given you but a garbled and feeble account of a powerful, convincing, and eloquent defence of liberal Christianity. The congregation seemed much interested and moved.

"I called on Dr. Wylie the next morning and requested him to preach for me. He stated that nothing would give him more pleasure than to do so, but that he could not stop any longer in the place. We had a long conversation, the particulars of which it would not be proper to repeat, but which furnished me with another proof of the delightful truth that liberal Christians are to be found in the ranks of every sect in Christendom.

Yours, truly,

"James Freeman Clarke."

INSTALLATIONS AND ORDINATION.

On Wednesday, March 26th, Rev. Henry F. Edes, late of Canton, was installed pastor of the Second Parish in Nantucket. Sermon by Rev. G. Putnam, of Roxbury.

On Wednesday, May 14th, Rev. O. A. Brownson, late of Walpole, N. H., was installed pastor of the First Congregational Parish in Canton. Sermon by Rev. G. Ripley, of Boston.

On the same day, Rev. Josiah Moore, late of Athol, was installed pastor of the First Congregational Church in Duxbury. Sermon by Rev. A. Young, of Boston.

On Wednesday, May 21st, Mr. Francis Cunningham was ordained pastor of the Third Congregational Society in Dorchester. Sermon by Rev. F. W. P. Greenwood, of Boston.